



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,259	11/28/2005	Jean-Paul Dagois	PF020145	8623
24498	7590	10/16/2008	EXAMINER	
Joseph J. Laks			MA, CALVIN	
Thomson Licensing LLC			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2 Independence Way, Patent Operations				2629
PO Box 5312				
PRINCETON, NJ 08543				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/16/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/532,259	DAGOIS, JEAN-PAUL	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	CALVIN C. MA	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION*****Specification***

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract is objected to because of the legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means". Examples are "drive means", "power supplying means"

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ishizuka et al. (US Patent: 6,771,235).

As to claim 1, Ishizuka discloses a device for displaying images comprising:

an image display panel (11) comprising a first array (14) and a second array of electrodes (13) (see Fig. 9-10, Col. 6, Lines 39-68) which serve an array of cells (i.e. the matrix array of light emitting element  $E(m,n)$ ), where each cell is powered between an electrode of the first array and an electrode of the second array effecting between them an intrinsic capacitor (i.e.  $C$  in Figure 1)  $C_i$  power supply means (i.e. the panel power supply means which provide the potential  $V_p$  and  $V_{cc}$ ) for generating a potential difference between two terminals (i.e. the two terminals are the  $V_p$  terminal and the ground terminal or  $V_{cc}$  terminal),

drive means:

adapted for successively connecting each electrode of the second array to one of the terminals of the power supply means (i.e. the scanning of the cathode line 13 means that the electrode are scanned or successively connected to the terminals  $V_{cc}$  or ground) (see Fig. 10, Col. 6, Lines 39-48),

adapted for, during each sequence of connection of an electrode of the second array, for simultaneously connecting one or more or even all the

electrodes of the first array to the other terminal of the power supply means to power at least one of the cells linked both to the respective electrode of the second array and the respective electrode or electrodes of the first array (i.e. during the scanning of the array of scan line electrode both data and scan line are connected to the respective power source by switches) (see Fig. 10, Col. 6, Lines 38-60), and adapted for being able, during each sequence of connection of an electrode of the second array, to transfer to each cell to be powered, the charge of the intrinsic capacitors of the other cells linked to the same electrode of the first array as the cell to be powered (i.e. the charge of the intrinsic capacitance are link to the electrode of the first array and since the first array during scanning the second array 13 may have both switches off this means that charges in the cell can be transferred when the switch is changed and the first array) (see Fig. 16, Col. 9, Lines 15-35).

As to claim 2, Ishizuka teaches the device as claimed in claim 1, wherein the drive means are adapted so that, during each sequence of connection of an electrode of the second array, the transfer of charge via each of the electrodes of the first array is favored at the expense of the connection of these electrodes to said power supply means (i.e. the charge are move from the first array electrode to the rest of the array and the electrode are set to ground or neutral this means that the selected electrode has charges transferred from the power source where the non-selected one are not charged) (see Fig. 10, Col. 6, 39-68).

As to claim 3, Ishizuka teaches the device as claimed in claim 1, wherein each image to be displayed being divided into pixels or subpixels to which are allocated luminous intensity data(i.e. the brightness level is to create gradation level) (see Fig. 11, Col. 7, Lines 40-67), each cell of the panel being assigned to a pixel or subpixel of the images to be displayed, it comprises means (12) of processing said data so as to be able, during each sequence of connection of an electrode of the second array, to modulate the duration of connection  $t'_{a1}$  of each electrode of the first array to said power supply means and to modulate the duration of transfer of charge  $t'_{a2}$  of the intrinsic capacitors of the other cells linked to the same electrode of the first array (i.e. the control PWM signal allows the modulation of the circuitry to create adequate gradation control), as a function of the luminous intensity datum of the cell powered between this electrode of the first array and this electrode of the second array (i.e. the overall control is applied by the PWM control which according to gradation level matches the signal and create the proper control sequences for both first array 14 and second array 13) (see Fig. 10, 11, Col. 6 Line 40-Col. 7 Line 67).

As to claim 4, Ishizuka teaches the device as claimed in claim 3, wherein the drive means (7,8) are adapted so that, during each sequence of connection of an electrode of the second array, said connection of each electrode of the first array to said power supply means is carried out, as appropriate, at the end of a

sequence and said transfer of charges is carried out, as appropriate, at the start of a sequence (i.e. since the sequence is the scanning of the data to each of the cell the electrodes must adjust at the beginning of a given line which is also the end of the previous scanning line, therefore both connection to power and transfer of charges happens at these junctions) (see Fig. 10, Col. 6, Lines 37-68).

As to claim 5 and 6, the adapted to clauses used in claim 5 and 6, are analyzed to have not limited the scope of the claims and are therefore rejected on the same ground as claim 1 which they are depended on (see MPEP 2111.04).

As to claim 7, Ishizuka teaches the device as claimed in claim 1, wherein said cells are electroluminescent (see Fig. 10, Col. 6, Lines 40-60).

As to claim 8, Ishizuka teaches the device as claimed in claim 7, wherein each cell comprises an organic electroluminescent layer (see Fig. 9, Col. 6, Lines 43-47).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishizuka in view of Aziz et al. (U.S. Patent 6,811,896).

As to claim 9, Ishizuka teaches the device as claimed in claim 8, but does not explicitly teach wherein the thickness of said layer is less than or equal to 0.2  $\mu$ m. Aziz teaches the layer of organic electroluminescent layer being equal to 200 nanometers (which is exactly 0.2 $\mu$ m) (see Col. 1, Lines 55-63).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the thickness layer of Aziz in the overall display design of Ishizuka in order to, “reduce OLED shorting.” (Aziz Col. 2, Lines 40-46).

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

***Inquiry***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Calvin Ma whose telephone number is

(571)270-1713. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chanh Nguyen can be reached on (571)272-7772. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Calvin Ma  
October 10, 2008

/Chanh Nguyen/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2629